



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/690,600	10/17/2000	Peter B. Hogerton	53434USA8C.009	2568

32692 7590 05/27/2004

3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY
PO BOX 33427
ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427

EXAMINER	
THAI, LUAN C	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2827	

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/690,600	HOGERTON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Luan Thai	2827

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 18 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b])

- a) The period for reply expires ____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 - (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: ____.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): ____.
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) ____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: ____.
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

- Claim(s) allowed: ____.
- Claim(s) objected to: ____.
- Claim(s) rejected: 16-19.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-15 and 20-23.
- 8. The drawing correction filed on ____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). ____.
- 10. Other: (See the attachment)

Luan Thai
Primary Examiner

5/25/04

(Attachment)

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 5/18/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the references cannot be combined to establish a prima-facie case of obviousness. The examiner disagrees with applicant's statement above because: Matsubara et al., as a primary reference, teach all the limitations of the claimed invention except for the process of bonding (e.g., *metallurgically bonding*) the conductive bumps to the integrated circuit chip. The process of *metallurgically bonding* is conventionally applied in the art, as taught by Japan Patent (JP-07130749A) and Yeh et al (5,607,099). Thus, the combinations of the cited references in the Office Action are proper. In addition, the missing claimed limitation of "*metallurgically bonding*" from the primary reference (e.g., Matsubara et al.) is taken to be a product by process limitation, and it is the patentability of the claimed product and not of recited process steps, which must be established. Therefore, when the prior art discloses a product, which reasonably appears to be identical with or only slightly different than the product claimed in a product-by process claim, a rejection based on sections 102 or 103 is fair. A product by process claim directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, *In re Hirao*, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See *In re Fessman*, 180 USPQ 324,326(CCPA 1974); *In re Marosi et al.*, 218 USPQ 289,292 (Fed. Cir. 1983); and particularly *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964,966 (Fed. Cir. 1985), all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final structure of the product "gleaned" from the process steps, which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, and not the

patentability of the process. See also MPEP 2113. Moreover, an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not a patentable product, whether claim in "product by process" claim or not. Noted that Applicant's present invention is to *provide a new way to simplify the flip-chip assembly process and enables to use of a broader range of materials thereby reducing assembly cost and improving interconnect reliability*, as stated in the "Summary of the Invention".

Thus, the examiner maintains the position that claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsubara et al. (JP-402023623A) in combination with Japan Patent (JP-07130749A) and/or with Yeh et al (5,607,099), separately, as set forth in the last Office Action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luan Thai whose telephone number is 571-272-1935.

The examiner can normally be reached on 6:45 AM - 4:15 PM, Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamand Cuneo can be reached on 571-272-1957. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Application/Control Number: 09/690,600
Art Unit: 2827

Page 4

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Luan Thai

May 25, 2004
United States Patent & Trademark Office
Primary Examiner
Jef-6A15
Art Unit 2827
(571) 272-1935